DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 185 SO 002 765

AUTHOR	Gray, Donald J.
TITLE	Report on the Arts and Humanities Institutes of 1966.
INSTITUTION	Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	66
NOTE	38p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary School Teachers; Evaluation; Film Study; *Fine Arts; *Humanities; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); Latin; Music; Secondary School Teachers; Theater Arts
IDENTIFIERS	Arts and Humanities Act

ABSTRACT

This report is one of a series presenting the results of studies of NDEA Title XI and Arts and Humanities Foundation institute programs and selected institute-associated activities conducted during 1966. Eleven institutes were offered in this year: three in music; two in art; two in theater; two in humanities; one in Latin; and one in film. A primary purpose of the institutes is to change the ways arts and humanities are taught in elementary and secondary schools. This report describes who and what was taught in these institutes; summarize what those who directed, attended and observed the institutes thought of them; and speculate about some of the issues and promises raised by their achievement. The report draws on three sources of information and opinion: analysis of the responses of about 300 participants to a questionnaire, final reports by the directors of the institutes, and detailed observer reports. All together these institutes enrolled about 430 participants. Most of the participants teach in secondary schools, and most of these teach in senior high schools. The participants generally thought very highly of the institutes; visitors were more impressed by those that concentrated on one subject, those that were innovative, and those that concretely defined proposals for new kinds of courses. (Author/JLB)

ED 026182

REPORT ON

THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES INSTITUTES OF 1966

By

Professor Donald J. Gray
Department of English
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

C.E. Pass

SP 002 765

1966

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FOREWARD

This report is one of a series presenting the results of studies of NDEA Title XI and Arts and Humanities Foundation institute programs and selected institute-associated activities conducted in 1966 by the Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs (CONPASS) for the U.S. Office of Education under Contract No. OEC2-6-001005-1005 and four subcontracts.

The Consortium was formed in May 1966 by the five associations which assessed the 1965 Title XI institute program – the American Historical Association, the Association of American Geographers, the Department of Audiovisual Instruction (NEA), the International Reading Association, and the Modern Language Association of America. Invitations to membership were subsequently extended to, and accepted by, the American Economic Association, the American Industrial Arts Association, and the American Political Science Association. Four members at large provide liaison with the arts and humanities, psychological tests and measurement, educational psychology, and teacher education specialists.

The objectives of CONPASS are to: provide a coordinated assessment of the effectiveness and impacts of institutes and other types of special teacher training programs; propose means of improving such programs; and provide a medium for dialogue among the professional associations and leading scholars of the several subject content disciplines and fields represented on its Board. These reports constitute a portion of the program developed to fulfill those objectives. It is hoped that they will prove useful to educators in general as well as to directors and prospective directors of institutes, officers of the U.S. Office of Education, and legislators and administrative officials of the Federal and States' Governments in their joint efforts to improve the quality of American education at all levels.

We take this opportunity to thank the consultants who conducted the studies and authored these reports for their diligent and conscientious performance of complex and exacting assignments.

Kenneth W. Mildenberger, Chairman William H. Wake, Director

PREFACE

The study from which this report proceeds was designed and conducted by a committee convened by the Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs. The members of the committee were: Donald J. Gray, Department of English, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana; Grose Evans, Curator, Extension Services, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; John F. Latimer, Classics Department, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.; John F. Morrison, Dean, College of Fine Arts, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio; and Lee Rigsby, Director, School of Music, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. Some of the data from the questionnaires used in the study was tabulated by Robert E. Stake, Associate Director, Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE), University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Dr. Stake is not responsible for the conclusions drawn from this data in the report. William H. Wake, Director of the Consortium, supervised the study for the Consortium.

CONTENTS

FOREWARD i
PREFACE iii
CONTENTS v

PART I – DESCRIPTIONS AND JUDGMENTS

Topics and Purposes 1
Participants 4
Faculty and Guest Lecturers 4
Programs 5
Some Broad Distinctions 6
Some General Conclusions on Effectiveness 7
Content and Methods. 8
The Program of the Institutes. 12
Peripheral Events. 14
The Schedule of the Institutes 15

PART II – RECOMMENDATIONS, ISSUES AND PROMISES

What are institutes in arts and humanities? 18
What is an institute in arts and humanities for? 20
What does it mean to say that the arts and humanities institutes of 1966 were effective?. 23
If the arts and humanities institutes of 1966 were effective, what were the principal means of their effectiveness? 24

PART III – PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES TO OFFICE OF EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRES

Table 1 – Summary 28
Table 2 – Knowledge and Skills Imparted. 29
Table 3 – Presentations. 30
Table 4 – Organization 31
Table 5 – Emphasis and Proporation 32
(Lecture, Audiovisual Presentation, Participation Learning (Seminars), Field Trips, Individual Study Periods, Free time)
Table 6 – Emphasis and Proportion 33
(Presenting Information in Subject Area, Presenting information on Instructional Methodology)
Table 7 – Effectiveness of the Total Institute Program 33

Part I

DESCRIPTIONS AND JUDGMENTS

During the summer of 1966, the U.S. Office of Education, administering funds made available under the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, supported eleven institutes for advanced study in the arts and humanities. These were the first institutes to be offered under the Arts and Humanities program. The following report will describe who and what was taught in these institutes; summarize what those who directed, attended, and observed the institutes thought of them; and speculate about some of the issues and promises raised by their achievement. The report draws on three sources of information and opinion: Analysis of the responses of about 300 participants to a questionnaire prepared by the U.S. Office of Education; final reports submitted by the directors of the institutes; and the detailed reports of the observers who visited five of the eleven institutes for two or three days.

Much of what is interesting and important about the institute in arts and humanities escapes the summary and computation which are the necessary procedures of a survey such as this one. The immediately interesting, and perhaps finally the most important, characteristic of the institutes in general was the variety of their topics, purposes, and programs. If the institutes do succeed in changing the ways in which arts and humanities are taught in elementary and secondary schools, the change may proceed as much from an isolated experiment, or from a general willingness to try fresh and various ways of teaching, as it does from those large and visible purposes and practices which are shared by most of the institutes and which, therefore, permit convenient summary. The second part of this report will try to define some characteristics and possibilities which, even though they may as yet be too tentative to manifest themselves on questionnaires and other instruments of summary, are nonetheless important parts of the achievement, and especially of the promise, of the arts and humanities institutes of 1966.

It is possible, however, to organize the information gathered by questionnaires and reports so that it supports some general remarks, some broad distinctions, and some rather unrefined conclusions. First, some general, largely descriptive remarks.

Topics and Purposes

The eleven institutes in arts and humanities were taught in public and private institutions of higher education in all sections of the country. They were given to several different subjects and purposes, and enrolled groups of teachers of quite different responsibilities and competences. There were, to begin with, three institutes in music.

a. That at the University of Iowa was concerned to educate secondary school teachers of music in the practices of music analysis, the literature of music (especially twentieth-century music), and in some of the new

materials being prepared at Iowa (under a grant from the Office of Education), for a new kind of secondary school music course. The end proposed by all the courses in the institute at Iowa is a high school music course which will study music as a subject with its own history and structure, a subject which is susceptible to the kinds of discussion and analysis conventionally conducted in courses in literature and history.

b. The institute at the University of Texas also enrolled secondary school teachers of music in courses in the history and analysis of music, as well as in courses in philosophy, literature, history, and the history of art. The end proposed by this curriculum is also a new kind of secondary school music course, one in which the study of music will be connected to the study of some of the other arts and humanities, either in a single course or in a music course which is part of a humanities program.

c. Finally, the institute at the University of Southern California enrolled music teachers and supervisors in a series of short courses in which they learned how other disciplines have defined their natures and structures as a preliminary to the creation of a new curriculum in the schools. The end proposed by the institute at Southern California is not simply to encourage the creation of a new kind of music course, but to promulgate the very principles of innovation. It looked not so much at the new ways of teaching music, but rather at new ways of making curricula, which in good time will contain new courses once it is decided what secondary school courses in music ought to be and try to do.

The two institutes in art display more divergent ends and characteristics.

a. That at Ohio State University enrolled high school art teachers, art supervisors, and members of college faculties of art education in courses and seminars in esthetics, art history, the social bases of art criticism, and new materials and methods in the teaching of art. Again, the end is the creation of a new kind of high school course for which materials had already been prepared (again, under a grant from the Office of Education). This new course will educate students in the history and analysis of art, and not merely in the techniques of its practice.

b. The institute in art at the Memphis Academy of art taught teachers in rural elementary schools who had taken only one or two college courses in art history and art education. The participants were enrolled in studio courses to be taught some of the fundamental techniques of painting and sculpture, and in courses in art history and art education to learn some of the most easily realized possibilities of teaching art in elementary grades. The purpose of the institute at Memphis Academy was not to encourage well-prepared teachers to try something new, but to help poorly-prepared teachers to establish and teach quite conventional art courses and programs.

The institute in theater at Wisconsin State University in River Falls, and the institute in Elizabethan stage at the University of Vermont, divide in their purposes and participants along the same lines.

a. The institute at Wisconsin State tried to repair large deficiencies by enrolling high school teachers who were responsible for staging plays

and pageants in their schools, but who had had little or no training in directing, acting, costuming, lighting, or even play selection. It offered courses in these fundamental technical matters, and a course as well in the history of the theater.

b. The institute at Vermont tried to enlarge the competence of already able high school teachers, all of whom teach courses in Shakespeare and the Elizabethan age, by lifting their eyes off the printed page. It drew heavily on the presence on the Vermont campus of a Shakespearean theatrical company to show its participants how Shakespeare's plays had been and are now being staged; and it invited scholars in Elizabethan music, art, literature, thought, and social history to teach in the institute in order to educate its participants in the culture out of which Shakespeare's play were written.

The two institutes in humanities were different from the other institutes in that they both tried to educate participants in several subjects, and in the relationships between them, rather than concentrating on one subject. The two institutes differed in purpose and in the kinds of participants they sought.

a. The institute at Bemidji (Minnesota) State College enrolled elementary school teachers who were sparsely educated in art, music, or literature: most often they were poorly educated in all three disciplines. The institute offered courses in the history of all three subjects, and it also offered studios and workshops in which the participants learned something of the craft of plastic arts and something about how art, music, and literature can be taught separately or in a humanities sequence in elementary grades.

b. The institute in humanities at the University of Oregon, on the other hand, enrolled very competent secondary school teachers who were either teaching in humanities programs, or who knew enough about one subject to be capable of stretching out to connect its matter to that of other subjects. The participants were enrolled in a series of short courses in a range of subjects: painting, architecture, and sculpture; theater and film; history; literature; philosophy; music. They were also enrolled in workshops which considered the practices of already established humanities courses and programs in schools all over the country. The point of it all seemed to be to make these well-educated participants aware of the consonances between the subject they teach and other subjects, and thereby kindle their enthusiasm for reaching beyond their subject to begin or participate in a humanities program.

Finally, the remaining two institutes were given to topics and purposes peculiar to themselves.

a. The institute in Latin at the University of Minnesota was conceived to propagate the idea and materials for a seventh-grade Latin course, necessary both to compete with the current practice of beginning to study modern foreign languages in junior high school, and to permit a six-year sequence (grades 7-12) which will allow for a study of Roman literature and culture now squeezed out of a cramped four-year sequence. To teach Latin in seventh grade requires new materials and methods. The institute

at Minnesota, therefore, had at its center a course which used some new materials and demonstrated new methods which had already been worked out in the university's department of classics. The institute also offered courses in linguistics, oral reading, and rapid translation to its already competent participants, all of whom were teaching or were soon to teach Latin to seventh-grade students.

b. The institute in film at Mount Saint Scholastica College in Atchison, Kansas, had at its center an almost total immersion in film. The idea of the institute is its director's conviction that the visual image is the dominant language of contemporary society. For two weeks secondary school teachers, mostly of English, looked at film (over fifty of them), discussed them in informal seminars, learned the rudimentary grammar and rhetoric of film, and considered how they could use films both to hold students who can no longer hear print, and to increase the capacities of students who will understand the structures of literature better if they are simultaneously educated in the structures of film.

Participants

All together these eleven institutes enrolled about 430 participants from nearly every state in the nation. Most of the participants (about 266) teach in secondary schools, and most of these teach in senior high schools. About sixty-five (15 percent) teach in elementary schools. Twelve teach in college. Of those whose responsibilities in their schools can be determined with some accuracy, the participants teach principally:

Music	140
English	135
Art	54
Latin	40
History or social studies	13
Speach	7
Humanities	7

All the participants hold a bachelor's degree; half hold a master's degree as well. Given the information available, it is possible only to guess at this next point. It would seem that about two-thirds of the participants have taken all their degrees in schools or departments of education, and the other third have taken at least one degree in an academic department.

Faculty and Guest Lecturers

The participants were taught by faculties which numbered about seventy-five teachers, and they were addressed by another fifty or so guest lecturers. Most of the faculties were made up of college teachers who had previously taught in institutes or in departments or programs whose principal function is the education of elementary and secondary school teachers. About half the members of the institutes' faculties ordinarily teach in departments or schools of education, art education, or music education. About as many ordinarily teach in academic departments – i.e., departments of art or art history as opposed to art education. Only a few – not more than

half-a-dozen – teach in elementary or secondary schools. On the faculties and among the guest speakers were also fifteen or so people whose principal commitment is to the practice rather than to the teaching of a discipline – painters and composers, actors and directors, people who make the art rather than study it. The effect of these latter teachers and speakers is one of those whose promise may be greater than a statistical summary can suggest, for it was by enlisting the talents of people such as these that the institutes helped to bring their participants to a fresh and direct engagement with the subjects they teach. That point will be more fully discussed in the second part of this report.

Programs

Even though the variations on the pattern were sometimes more interesting than the pattern, there was something of a common curriculum in the institutes. In general, the programs of the institutes in arts and humanities were made up of three different kinds of courses.

1. Lecture courses. The vehicles of the basic matter of the institutes, meeting at least twice weekly and including such courses as art history, theater, esthetics, the principles of curriculum revision, the history and language of film, etc.

2. Practice, of two kinds.

   a. Seminars and studios: small classes, meeting at least once weekly throughtout the term of the institute, in which the matter of the lectures is discussed, actually practiced, or in some way extended: e.g., seminars in which the lecturer or another member of the faculty investigates with ten or fifteen participants topics which grow from the lectures; seminars in which the participants present to one another analyses of a painting or a piece of music; studios in which the participants directly observe or practice techniques of the disciplines they are studying.

   b. Workshops in pedagogy: small classes, meeting at least weekly during the term of the institute, given to the survey, and sometimes to the preparation, of courses of study, reading lists, and other material which has explicitly to do with how the matter of the institute is or can be taught in elementary and secondary schools.

3. Peripheral events. Guest lectures; field trips to theaters, galleries, museums, etc.; observation of demonstration classes; and similar occasional excursions which supplement the ideas and information set out in the lectures and practica of the institute.

All eleven arts and humanities institutes offered lecture courses. In all but one (the institute in film at Mount Saint Scholastica, which scheduled only a formal lecture at the beginning and another at the end of its two weeks of films) the principal energy of the institute flowed through the lecture courses. Seven of the eleven institutes offered workshops in pedagogy. Nine offered studio or seminar classes, including all but one of the seven which also conducted workshops. All but one of the institutes had something happening on their peripheries. Principally, all but one invited guest speakers,

and all but four invested significant importance in one or more trips to museums, galleries, or theaters.

Some broad distinctions

Within this collection of resemblances and differences in topics, purposes, participants, and programs, it is possible to discern at least three principles by which the arts and humanities institutes may be sorted out as being of one kind or another. First, some of the institutes were given primarily to a single subject (Iowa, Ohio State, Texas), while others tried to connect several subjects to one another in a frame called "humanities" (Oregon, Bemidji State). Most of the institutes which concentrated on a single subject typically offered as well at least one course in a related subject: the institute at Iowa, for example, offered a course in the history of painting and literature as well as courses in music literature, analysis, and modes of performance. The difference is one of intention and emphasis. Some institutes are fundamentally organized to the effect changes in the teaching of a single subject. Thus the institute at Vermont pulled together the perspective of many disciplines to focus them on the single question of how Shakespeare's plays are to be read, imagined, and taught. Other institutes are organized to emphasize several subjects equally so that teachers will be more competent in all of them at the end of the institute, or so that they will perceive the relationships between subjects which will permit them to be taught together in a humanities course or program.

A second distinction is that between institutes whose purpose is to innovate and those whose purpose is to improve – between institutes which propose to create new courses and programs, and those which propose to help teachers teach existing courses and programs better. This distinction is not simply between those institutes (Bemidji State, the Memphis Academy, Wisconsin State) which enrolled inadequately prepared teachers, and those which enrolled well-prepared teachers. It is true that institutes whose purposes were openly remedial were fundamentally concerned to change their participants so that they taught more effectively, and not to change the courses in which they taught. But so were the institutes in film at Mount Saint Scholastica and in the Elizabethan stage at Vermont, both of which enrolled very competent teachers in studies intended to help them teach better the courses in literature and history they were already teaching. The director of the institute at Oregon, on the other hand, quite clearly intended that, among its other effects, the institute work to persuade people who were not teaching in humanities courses or programs to try to establish such courses or programs in their schools. The institutes at Iowa and Texas held clearly in view a new kind of secondary school music course, just as the institutes at Ohio State and Minnesota held in view radically new courses in art and Latin. These latter institutes were planned not just to change teachers who might use their new knowledge to change the courses they teach. They were planned directly and openly to change courses as well as teachers – to teach their participants something new about their subjects, and to persuade them that what they had learned cannot be taught to their own students unless the curricula of the schools is radically changed.

Finally, a third distinction may be drawn between those institutes which were quite explicit and concrete in their proposals for new courses and programs in the schools, and those institutes which did not specify the changes they nonetheless called for. Behind the summer's study at Ohio State, Iowa, and Minnesota, for example, were several years of work which had created the scheme and materials for new kinds of secondary school courses in art, music, and Latin. The institute in music at Southern California was explicitly conceived as the first step in a sequence which will lead to a thorough revision of the music curriculum in the Los Angeles secondary schools, although the shape and content of this curriculum is not as well defined as are the new courses promulgated at Ohio State, Iowa, and Minnesota. The institutes at Oregon and Texas, on the other hand, advocated the idea of new courses and programs – a humanities program, a secondary school course in which music will be related to the other arts. But the changes themselves were not specified. Graduates of these institutes could not comfortably inhabit the old curricula, as might, for example, graduates of the institutes at Vermont or Bemidji State. But if curricular changes were necessary to put to work the knowledge they had learned in the institutes, it was up to the participants themselves to devise these changes.

Some general conclusions on effectiveness

So far as the participants' opinion of the general effectiveness of the institutes is concerned, none of the distinctions laid out above make very much difference. The participants generally thought very highly of the institutes in arts and humanities. Asked on the questionnaire to judge the total effectiveness of the institute each attended, about two-thirds of the participants judged it to be "outstanding," and most of the other one-third judged it to be "good" (Table I, Item D). Participants in institutes given to a single subject did not differ markedly in their estimates from those who attended institutes which emphasized several subjects equally (Table 7). Nor are there any marked differences between the estimate of overall effectiveness offered by those participants in institutes whose purposes were to create new courses, and those whose purposes were to improve the teaching in already established courses. (Compare, for example, the judgments recorded in Table 7 of, on the one hand, the elementary school teachers who attended the institute at Bemidji State, and the secondary school teachers who attended the institute at Ohio State, or the secondary school teachers who attended the very different institutes at Oregon and Iowa.)

The visitors to the institutes, however, were more favorably impressed by those which concentrated on one subject, which were innovative, and whose proposals for new kinds of courses were concretely defined. Three of the five visitors' reports were highly favorable. All three described and evaluated institutes (Ohio State, Iowa, and Minnesota) not only given to a single subject but organized around a concretely developed idea of how the subject can be taught in secondary schools. The two reports which were more moderate in their approval – although still approving – described institutes (Bemidji State and Wisconsin State) which enrolled teachers poorly prepared even to teach the courses they were already teaching. The visitor to the institute at Bemidji State wondered whether

the institute might have been more effective if it had not been organized as a broad chronological survey of art, music, and literature, but had rather been arranged to concentrate on the arts of a single period, or to subject a relatively few works of different media and periods to one or two kinds of study (analysis of their structures, study in their historical context, etc.). The visitor to the institute at Wisconsin State thought the remedial ends of the institute proper and likely to be effected. But he thought that the institute would have been more exciting to the participants (who in fact, for reasons having to do with its organization as well as its content, were not very much stirred by their summer) if it had more audaciously tried to suggest ways to move theater into the center of the secondary school curriculum – to propose or help the participants to imagine a course in theater, rather than simply trying to help teachers to direct one or two plays a year. Such a purpose, the visitor goes on to say, would have required that the director of the institute seek to enroll very competent and confident teachers, who can quickly move to undertake large and thorough changes, rather than to enroll teachers whose competence is uncertain and inadequate even to the limited responsibilities they now exercise.

Add to these latter remarks the judgment of one of the directors of an institute in humanities (that at Oregon) that he now thinks it more profitable to organize an institute which concentrates on one subject, and the balance between the several kinds of institutes in arts and humanities begins to tip a little. That at least is the first, qualified conclusion of this report:

> In the opinion of their participants, there is no discernable difference in the effectiveness of the several kinds of arts and humanities institutes conducted in the summer of 1966. But the visitors to the institutes, and at least one of their directors, think that institutes which are given to a single subject are more likely to be incisive and exciting than institutes which emphasize several subjects equally. Further, the visitors think that institutes which are specific in their plans to create new courses and programs are both more exciting and more likely to be effective than institutes which prepare teachers to teach existing courses better, or encourage them to devise new courses for themselves.

Content and Methods

The opinion of the participants and the visitors on some other topics are more decisive, and more nearly coincide. Everywhere one looks in the information and opinion collected for this report it is clear that the directors and faculty of the institutes were primarily committed to teaching the content of humane studies, and not (with a few exceptions) the methods by which the disciplines can be taught in elementary and secondary schools. Over half (55.1 percent) of the more than 300 participants who returned the questionnaires thought that the institutes were "outstanding" in imparting "content in subject matter" (Table 2, Item A 1a). Almost three-fourths (74.4 percent) were satisfied by the amount of time apportioned to lectures (Table 1, Item C 3a). Over three-fourths (79.5 percent) were satisfied by the relative proportion of time given to presenting "information in the subject area" (Table 1, Item C 4a).

In contrast, only about a third of the participants who completed the questionnaire thought the institute "outstanding" in imparting knowledge and skill in "instructional methodology" and "instructional media" (Table 1, Items A 1c and d). Only 40 percent thought that the institutes were "outstanding" in identifying "content essential to effective instruction" – that is, more participants (55.1 percent) thought the faculties of the institutes to be very good at teaching their subjects, than thought them to be very good at suggesting what topics in their subjects ought to be taught in elementary and secondary schools (Table 1, Item A 1b). Two-thirds (63.7 percent) of the participants thought the relative amount of time given to "presenting information on instructional methods" was "about right" – a reassuring judgment, but one still markedly less approving than that tendered by the three-fourths of the participants who were satisfied that the amount of time given to content was "about right" (Table 1, Item C4). Another way to measure this difference is to note that 28.2 percent of the participants in the institutes who answered the questionnaire thought that more time should have been given to instruction in methods, while only 17.9 percent thought that more time should have been given to lectures (Table 1, Item C4). Similarly, about one-fourth of the participants thought that more time should have been given to "Participation learning sessions: workshops, seminars, etc." (Table 1, Item C 3a). Both these latter opinions require some further scrutiny. But along with other judgments on this point, they too suggest that the faculty of the institutes was more interested and effective in teaching, say, art history and music analysis than it was in explicitly instructing the participants in the ways of teaching art and music to their own students.

The visitors not only agree with this judgment. They share the assumptions about institutes which made the judgment inevitable. The arts and humanities institutes, like the NDEA institutes in history, English, and other subjects, were planned by their directors to educate elementary and secondary school teachers in the content of certain disciplines. With a few exceptions, everything that favorably impressed the visitors forcefully manifested these intentions. The visitors were struck by lectures concerned with the content and procedures of history of art and music, the analysis of paintings, works of music, and literary texts; the bases and procedures of esthetic judgment; the identification and history of certain commanding notions in intellectual history. The visitors were not usually much taken by, or even interested in, conventional workshops in pedagogy. They were impressed, however, by seminars and studios in the content of disciplines – classes in which participants presented analyses of paintings, or works of music to one another, or actually worked out before their colleagues how they would direct a scene in a play, or actually worked in the craft of a discipline. Further, the visitors reported little anxiety among the participants about the relevance of all they were learning to the necessities of teaching it in their own classrooms. In short, the visitors accept and implicitly endorse the idea that institutes in arts and humanities primarily achieve their purpose – to improve the teaching of their subjects in elementary and secondary schools – by educating teachers in the matter of their subjects, and not by instructing them in the methods of teaching them.

Many participants also accept and endorse this emphasis. It is worth noting that even though the participants who returned the questionnaires consistently judged their institutes to be less effective in teaching methods

than in teaching the matter of their subjects, 42.5 percent of them still thought the institutes "outstanding" in imparting knowledge and skills useful in improving or creating curricula (Table 1, Item A 1e). (Compare the 33.7 percent and 30.5 percent who thought the institutes "outstanding" in telling participants about instructional methods and media: Table 1, Items A 1c and d) Apparently the participants too think that there are more ways to help teachers change curricula than by explicitly telling them how to do it. More interesting, the questionnaires invited the participants to volunteer comments about the content and emphasis of the institutes. Many regretted that the institute they attended had not given more time to the questions of exactly how subjects ought to be taught in the schools, or had not conducted such exercises in pedagogy more effectively. But many more went out of their way to rejoice that the institute they attended had not emphasized or even paid much attention to pedagogical methods and media. Some vigorously protested that such questions were even asked. "A 'sold' teacher can find ways to 'sell' students," one participant wrote across the question which asked him to estimate the effectiveness of the institute in telling him how to teach his courses; and another wrote in response to a similar question: "I didn't come to get THIS!" There is no way to measure it, but such opinions were far more intense than the regrets of those people who wanted to learn more about methods and media.

It should be added that participants who attended different kinds of institutes do offer somewhat different judgments on the questions of the proper emphasis and effectiveness of instruction in pedagogy. Two large exceptions must be acknowledged immediately. The institute in Latin at Minnesota had at its center a course which was explicitly intended to induct teachers in a knowledge of the methods and media (many of them audiovisual or multisensory) of a very carefully worked out seventh-grade course in Latin. This emphasis accounts for the fact that 76.3 percent of the participants in this institute thought the institute "outstanding" in improving their knowledge of instructional methodology (compare 33.7 percent for all institutes whose participants completed the questionnaire), 68.4 percent thought it outstanding in improving their knowledge of instructional media (compare 30.5 percent for all institutes), and 71 percent thought it outstanding in educating them in how to improve curricula (compare 42.5 percent) (Table 2, Items A 1c, d, and e). The institute at Southern California was similarly explicit in its emphasis on how to teach its subject, although it emphasized not the content of a specific course but the very principles from which new courses ought to proceed. The participants in this institute were also untypically high in their estimate of its effectiveness in teaching them about specific ways of curricular improvement and innovation: 53.8 percent thought the institute outstanding in improving their knowledge of instructional methods (compare 33.7 percent for the other institutes), and 66.7 percent thought it outstanding in teaching them how to improve curricula (compare 42.5 percent) (Table 2, Items A 1c and e).

The significance of these differences is also apparent in some more narrow differences between the opinions of participants who attended one or the other of the several kinds of institutes. Participants in institutes which emphasized several subjects equally and which did not propose a concretely defined body of ideas and materials immediately useful in elementary and secondary schools (Oregon, Bemidji State, Vermont) did not rank improvement in instructional methodology high among the achievements of

the institute. Many participants in these institutes also thought that more time should have been given to presenting information about how to teach (Table 2, Item A 1c; Table 6). Participants in institutes which did concentrate on a single subject and which were planned to propose an already defined course or program (Ohio State, Iowa, Minnesota) were more satisfied with the amount of time given to instructional methodology (Table 2, Item A 1c; Table 6). But except for those who attended the institute in Latin at Minnesota, these participants did not think the institute extraordinarily effective in improving instructional methodology, although they thought them more effective in this matter than the participants at the institutes at Oregon, Bemidji State, and Vermont judged those institutes to be (Table 2, Item A 1c).

There remains also the fact that there is not much correlation between the participants' opinions about the effectiveness of their institute in teaching them how to teach, and the effectiveness of their institute in directing them toward an improved or new curriculum. For example, 46.2 percent of the participants in the institute at Bemidji, 37.5 percent of those in the institute at Vermont, and 51.3 percent of those in the institute at Oregon thought these institutes outstanding in helping or encouraging them to improve the curriculum of their schools. But only 25.6 percent of the participants at Oregon, 12.8 percent of those at Bemidji State, and 18.7 percent of those at Vermont thought the institute outstanding in offering explicit instruction in how to teach their subjects.

It again seems, then, that teaching people how to teach is not the only, and by no means a sure, way to persuade them that they are now ready to improve the ways in which arts and humanities are taught in elementary and secondary schools. That conclusion moves to justify the assumptions of those college teachers who planned, taught, and visited the institutes that their proper emphasis ought to be on the content of the subjects to which the institutes were given. This conclusion does not properly acknowledge the peculiar force and promise some of the visitors saw in institutes which were very explicit not only about what ought to be taught in the schools, but about the shape and content of the courses in which it ought to be taught. More will be said of this in the second part of this report. Here, it is enough to remark that the opinions of the participants and visitors about the emphasis in the arts and hunanities on the content of their subjects permits these conclusions:

The institutes were on the whole better at educating participants in the content of their subjects than they were at teaching the participants how to teach their subjects.

Most of the participants, and all of the directors and visitors, accept this emphasis as useful and proper.

Institutes which were single in their topics, and explicit and concrete in their proposals about the courses to be taught in the schools, were more likely to be judged by the participants as highly effective in teaching instructional methods than were institutes which emphasized several subjects equally and did not propose new and concretely defined courses.

But to propose a specific course or program is not necessarily to persuade participants that the institute is extraordinarily effective in promoting curricular innovation and improvement. Such change is the common end of all institutes, and there is no evidence in the opinions canvassed in this section of the report that one kind of institute is more likely than another to achieve this end more quickly and thoroughly.

The Programs of the Institutes

The questionnaire completed by the participants was prepared by the U.S. Office of Education for use in all institutes for advanced study and was, therefore, of necessity somewhat broad and generalized. Sometimes it was required that the participants interpret its questions and distinctions so that they fit the institute they attended. This necessity in turn required that the participants' responses to some questions be interpreted, where that was possible, and then only used gingerly.

If, for example, "Presentation by Faculty" (Item B 1a) means "lectures," then the participants were in most instances well satisfied with the lectures in the institutes.* This reading of the question and its responses is consonant with the responses which affirm that three-fourths of the participants were satisfied with the amount of time given to lectures (Tables 1 and 5, Item C 3a). It is also consonant with the general agreement that institutes ought primarily to educate teachers in their subjects, an enterprise conventionally and economically conducted by means of lecture.

Matters are more complicated in interpreting what the participants think of the several kinds of practica which were offered in last summer's institutes in arts and humanities. The visitors, who pretty much took for granted the prevalence and competence of lectures in the institutes, were very much struck by how frequently and freshly seminars, studios, and other small classes were used to engage participants directly with the content and craft of their disciplines. The visitors were not nearly as favorably impressed with the occasional workshops in pedagogy they encountered, which seemed to be peripheral at best, distracting and diffidently conducted at worst. There is, unfortunately, no way to discover what the participants think. All the questions about the courses this report calls "practica" lump workshops together with seminars and studios, all of them together being described as "Participation Learning Sessions." A central distinction common in the arts and humanities institutes is thus lost, the distinction between small classes which offered instruction in pedagogy, and small classes which offered new ways for the participants to engage directly in

*Two apparent exceptions – the institutes at Southern California and Vermont – are not really exceptions. The principal matter of both institutes was carried in lectures which were given by very distinguished people who, usually, remained in the institute only for a week or two. Almost certainly, therefore, the participants expressed their opinion of these principal lecturers in their responses to the question about guest speakers (Item B 1b). "Faculty" to the participants in these two institutes undoubtedly means the resident faculty who served as discussion leaders in the seminars which customarily followed the lectures.

their discipline by teaching it to one another, practicing it, or watching others practice it. The point of raising this difficulty is to protect the high opinion in which the visitors held some of the seminars and studios (but not the workshops in pedagogy) against the relatively low opinion in which the participants held "Participation Learning Sessions," whatever they may have thought them to be. It simply is not possible to know whether the visitors and the participants are judging the same course.

Nor is it possible to distinguish the participants' opinions about, on the one hand, those lecture or seminar courses which instructed them in the subject on which the institute concentrated from, or the other, their opinions about those courses in related subjects – courses in "related arts" in an institute in music, for example, or in literature or in an institute in art. The opinion of the visitors, and of some of the directors, is clear enough. In an institute devoted to a single subject courses in other subjects seem not to have been taken very seriously by the participants, were pushed by the pressure of time to the periphery of the institute, and were in general less efficient and effective than those courses in the subject on which the institute concentrated. Again, however, it is not possible to know what the participants think.

But it is clear that whatever the participants think "Participation Learning Sessions" means, they want more of them (Tables 1 and 5, Item C 3c). There are not significant differences in this opinion between participants in the several different kinds of institutes, except that the opinion is particularly strong among participants in the institute at Oregon, an especially fast and ambitious institute which enrolled fifty participants in a four-week sequence of courses in over half a dozen subjects. Some of the participants who want an alternative to lectures undoubtedly are anxious to be instructed in how to teach all they are learning – in a word, they want a conventional workshop. Others, however, in their comments on the questionnaires suggest that they would like to do more, to listen to other teachers talk, to be listened to themselves, to act as well as receive. Institutes like those taught this summer in arts and humanities are in their nature new, and free to innovate yet farther. They ought, therefore, to afford profitable opportunities to devise ways of teaching which can supplement or replace those in which students immediately fall into a passive role while a textbook, a lectern, and a continuously talking teacher is placed between them and their subject. If the participants are to be believed – and the visitors at least believe them – the institutes in arts and humanities have not yet fully exploited these opportunities to allow a significant part of the institute to be carried by something other than lecture courses.

Here, again, the opinions of participants, visitors, and directors about the courses in the institutes in arts and humanities permit these conclusions:

> As can be expected in institutes which emphasize content over methods, lectures were in general judged to be more effective than other means of instruction, especially workshops in pedagogy.
>
> The visitors to the institutes, however, were very favorably impressed with some ingeniously devised small courses –

seminars and studios – in which the participants were engaged in their subjects in direct and fruitful ways.

In institutes which concentrated on one subject, courses in related subjects were likely to become of secondary and even peripheral importance.

A significant number of participants thinks that the institutes ought to include more courses which are different from lectures, either workshops in pedagogy or small courses in which the participants can in some way work for themselves with the matter of the subject they must return to their schools to teach.

Peripheral Events; Guest Speakers; and Field Trips

The visitors, many of the participants, and most of the directors agree that guest lecturers in institutes are often disappointing, sometimes distracting, and almost always a waste of time. (Again, the opinion of participants about guest lecturers is disguised in Table 1, Item B 1b, by the inclusion of opinions about the guest lecturers in the institutes at Southern California and Vermont, who really performed the function undertaken by the faculty in other institutes. If the figures in this table are corrected to recognize the peculiar role of these lecturers, the percentage of participants in all eight institutes who thought guest lecturers "outstanding" drops to about 29 percent, while the percentage of those who thought the faculty outstanding rises to about 54 percent.) The participants, the visitors, and the directors all agree why guest lecturers are likely to be unworthy of the time they fill. Guest speakers in an institute are almost always talking to an audience which has become a community with its own character, very tightly knit in its knowledge, intentions, opinions, and prejudices. Unless (as at Southern California and Vermont) what he is saying is in fact the central matter of the institute, therefore, a guest speaker is likely always to be a stranger at best. When he enters a community full of people who are working very hard at matters they think to be more important than the message he carries, he has to be very good indeed not to be dismissed or resented as an intrusively unwelcome stranger.

The visitors and the directors thought more highly of field trips. Often trips to museums, theaters, or the studios of artists worked to demonstrate the subject of the institute in the same ways that seminars and studios did. A visit to the Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis, for example, made concrete some of the possibilities of theater in which the institute at Wisconsin State was trying to educate its participants, just as the observation of a demonstration class put the participants in the institute at Minnesota in the very presence of the excitement that can be created by the kind of Latin course the institute proposed. On the whole, however, participants do not think as highly of field trips as the visitors do. When the excursions are carefully planned to be an important part of the institute's curriculum – for example, the trip to the Guthrie; or trips to museums from which the participants in the institute at Ohio State were required to return with a short analysis and judgment of one painting – when they are so planned, the participants judged them very favorably.

But the comments of even these participants on the questionnaires suggest that for participants, field trips are a form of recreation as much as they are a means of education. Thus, participants in institutes which arranged only visits to local schools, or other excursions which are not markedly different from the day-to-day curriculum, expressed regret that they had not been scheduled to go away from the campus for a day or so on a field trip. Participants in institutes which arranged field trips which for one reason or another were arduous (an eight-hour bus ride for an afternoon in a museum) often volunteered complaints that they would rather have spent the time studying. It is not to demean the continuous industry of the participants to observe that they approve of field trips when they are a pleasant break in the routine of the institute, disapprove of them when the excursions add to rather than relax their already full days, and wish they could go on a field trip when the schedule of the institute offers no such diversion. The lesson seems to be that the uses of field trips are thereapeutic as well as educational, and that when they add rather than relieve work, their value both as recreation and education is badly compromised.

The Schedule of the Institutes

Visitors, directors, and almost all the participants agree that the schedules of this summer's institutes were too full. The pace of the institutes is one of the things that seems to make them effective. As many participants remarked on the questionnaires, it is the intensity of the experience which makes it exciting and effective, which makes ideas fuse, and then generate new ideas. Again and again, participants remark with gratitude that they were treated as adults by those who taught and directed the institutes. Much of this response must be attributed to the fact that the participants are pleased and flattered that they were asked to do so much, to work so hard.

But nonetheless, the institutes in the arts and humanities in the summer of 1966 did not, in the opinion of most of the people who visited, learned, or taught in them, leave enough time for the participants fully to take in even the centrally important matter which was being pumped out at them in lecture courses. Typically, an institute scheduled three or four lecture courses, each meeting at least three times a week. To these were usually added at least two seminars, studios, or workshops, usually meeting twice a week. Such a schedule cannot tolerate the luxuries of guest speakers who are not exactly to the point, or allow for field trips at all. More important, such schedules are not ventilated with spaces which permit participants to organize their own ways of studying their subjects, or permit them simply to move for an hour or two on their own imperatives, to make their own discoveries, or simply to catch their breaths. It may be useful, then, but it is not crucially important to observe that guest lecturers seem most often to interrupt rather than to advance the enterprise of the institute, and that field trips are as likely to be useful as a means of escaping the normal schedule of the institute as they are as a means of instructing participants in its topics. The conclusion which matters here is:

> The schedules of the institutes in arts and humanities taught in the summer of 1966 were too full. To reduce the number of guest speakers, and add or subtract field trips to alleviate the

pace of the schedules, may be useful ways to remedy symptoms. But what the institutes really seem to be crowded with are courses. The pressure and pace of a very full curriculum go far to create the exhileration which seems characteristic of institutes. But the very number of courses in a curriculum typically organized around lecture courses pushes other events and courses (including courses in related subjects) to the periphery and thus limits their value. More important, such a schedule makes the participants passive captives of lecture courses by limiting the time in which they can organize their own studies, and make their own discoveries in them.

Part II

RECOMMENDATIONS, ISSUES, AND PROMISES

Always, the finally important point about institutes is what will happen next time, in the schools and in the institutes, and not what happened last time. It is difficult to predict the effect of the arts and humanities institutes of 1966. Only eleven institutes were taught, most for the first time, in a handful of subjects. Nothing could be thorough or decisive. To educate 150 art teachers in four or five different institutes, each founded on a different notion of what art teachers should know and teach, is to not move very far across the surface.

But there were lessons, and there will be effects. One way to describe the lessons and effects is to set out some recommendations, based on the emphases and directions which seemed most profitable last summer, for those who will plan, administer, and teach future institutes in arts and humanities.

1. The arts and humanities institutes of 1966 were exciting and effective. Institutes in each of the subjects taught last summer – art, music, theater, film, Latin, humanities – should be continued. Nor is there any finally conclusive reason not to support each of the several kinds of institutes tried last summer. The Arts and Humanities Foundation and the U.S. Office of Education should, however, aggressively solicit proposals for institutes in additional disciplines and topics; institutes organized around topics which cut across disciplines; and institutes organized in different ways (institutes which emphasize seminars and studios; separate institutes in related subjects which meet on a common campus and share certain courses and resources).

One of the points about institutes in general is that they are free to take up topics which do cut across the territories of university schools and departments, and to devise courses which are free of university requirements and curriculum committees. A coordinate point about arts and humanities institutes is that they are often in subjects which are not central in the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools, or are not in the curriculum at all. College teachers should, therefore, be encouraged to use the freedom of institutes to devise new ways to teach teachers, to invent new topics to teach them, and to encourage elementary and secondary school teachers to put new and important courses in curricula which now contain

no courses, or only peripheral courses, in subjects commonly taught in the institutes.

2. If a choice had to be made among the several kinds of institutes taught in the summer of 1966, institutes which are single in their subject and explicitly innovation in their purposes should be preferred to those which emphasize several subjects equally and principally try to improve the teaching of courses already established. And if a choice had to be made between an institute which was single in its subject and one which promised to set fresh currents flowing through the schools by teaching a topic which cuts across disciplines, then innovation should be preferred.

The premise of these choices is that the major purpose of the institutes – to improve the ways arts and humanities are taught in the schools – will be best served by institutes which are planned to effect changes in courses, and not only to effect changes in the teachers themselves. It is one thing to return from an institute with sharp and concrete ideas about the content and even the pedagogy of a new course in music, or Latin, or dance. It is another to come back with the idea that it would be exciting if teachers of all three subjects can get together to work out in somebody's course a sequence in classical drama.

Both sets of effects are valuable, and both deserve support. However, large and immediate effects are more likely to be created by institutes which suggest plausible and concrete modes of change by concentrating on one subject, or by holding in view fresh and specific proposals for change, or, preferably, by being both single in their focus and precise and concrete in their proposals for innovation.

3. The institutes in arts and humanities should persevere in their emphasis on the content of their subjects over the methods of teaching it. Such an emphasis is in the proper nature of such institutes, which are conceived as instruments for improving how people teach by educating them in their subjects. More important, there is no evidence that the way to persuade people to change curricula is to instruct them in the methods of teaching it. On the contrary many participants, and probably all the faculty, in the institutes seem to think that teachers are moved to change the courses they teach when they are educated in new ideas, material, and emphases to be taught in them. The new ideas and material may well be defined – the visitors would say, are best defined – within an already developed syllabus for a new kind of course. But it need not be so defined. The important point is that teachers somehow be primarily educated in the subject matter of their courses, old or new, and not in the methods and machinery adopted or devised for teaching them.

4. Because institutes properly emphasize the content of their subjects, lectures are the traditional and most convenient way to teach in them. But directors of institutes should try to devise ways in which to make seminars, studios, and similar kinds of courses at least as important as lecture courses. The potential liberation of institutes from the impedimenta of university organization should be exploited to set in motion changes in the ways prospective and experienced teachers of arts and humanities – and other students of arts and humanities too – are taught in colleges and universities. Especially, directors of institutes should consider ways in which

participants can be engaged directly with the stuff of their subjects in seminars and studios; ways in which small classes can be used for the teachers to educate one another (to show one another how to elucidate a painting or a piece of music, for example, rather than preparing for one another a recent bibliography of secondary school courses of study); ways to stimulate the individual participant to undertake a meaningful, independent research project such as, say, drafting for himself an historical account from primary sources, rather than working on a committee with five other teachers to put together what half a dozen textbooks have to say about Populism or the Armory Show.

5. The schedules of the institutes in arts and humanities ought to be less crowded. Some lectures ought to be replaced by seminars, studios, and other kinds of courses in which the participants act and set the pace for themselves. Some peripheral events and even some courses ought to be replaced by space for individual study or modes of study the participants organize for themselves. Certainly the number of guest speakers usually can be reduced without loss, and even with some profit. Probably too, workshops in pedagogy and (in institutes given to a single subject) courses in related arts can sometimes be eliminated. The effect of these latter decisions will be to increase the relative weight given to the content of the discipline, and to increase the attention given to a single subject.

However, changes in the schedules of the institutes should not simply increase the relative number of hours the participants spend listening to the faculty talk about their subject. Changes should also increase the variety of ways in which the participants confront their subjects, and permit them in some ways to engage themselves directly with their subjects by actually practicing or teaching the matter and procedures they are studying.

These recommendations are not to be read as legislation. They are intended to specify certain possibilities, not to prompt others which may profitably run counter to them. They are one way to resolve some issues and to describe some promises which seem to the people who visited the institutes and are responsible for this report, to loom large in the achievement of the arts and humanities institutes of 1966.

Another way to order the lessons of these institutes is not to choose among their characteristics and possibilities, but to frame some of the questions raised by the conduct of last summer's institutes, and to summarize some of the most common and most promising answers worked out by their directors and faculty. Each director of a future institute will work out his own answers – but he will address the same questions:

1. What are institutes in arts and humanities?

By function, the institutes are practical. They exist to teach people how to do something, and their efforts are finally to be measured not by how much the participants know because of the institute, but how much they can do that they could not do before.

This kind of education is not habitual to many of those who plan and teach in institutes in arts and humanities. Their engagement with their

subject is characteristically liberal rather than practical. Their concern is to practice and elucidate their discpline, to study it by themselves and with others simply because it is absorbing and worth studying.

These two qualities are not exclusive. Their opposition is perhaps sharper in institutes in arts and humanities than it is in institutes in other subjects, for such subjects as art, music, theater, and Latin have strong traditions as liberal arts which have always been studied and practiced simply for themselves. But to ask that this kind of study serve practical ends is not to dissolve or compromise its liberal claims. The ground premise of the institutes in arts and humanities is that the way a subject is taught is, first of all, a function of what the subject is. If finally the institutes are concerned with the practical matter of how the subject is taught, those who conceived and conducted them seem to agree that the study of the subject for itself is the liberal means to that practical end.

Thus, the institutes at Southern California, Iowa, and Ohio State retained their liberal characters even though they were founded on the very practical purposes of establishing a specific kind of course in the schools. All were somehow concerned with what their subject is. The institute at Southern California required its participants to undertake a rigorous study of the nature of structure of the subject of music as a preliminary to the writing of a new curriculum. The institutes at Iowa and Ohio State took their participants through a series of historical and critical exercises so that they learned both their subject and how their subject should be taught if its identity as a humane study is to be honored.

More important, the new kinds of courses proposed by these and other institutes are courses which will enable the students in them to study one of the arts and humanities as a liberal discipline. The secondary school courses explicitly proposed by the directors and faculty of the institutes at Iowa and Ohio State are courses which will not merely teach students to play musical instruments or to make posters. The courses are also, and primarily, intended to educate students in the history of music or art, and in the vocabulary and procedures by which works of music and plastic art can be analyzed, discussed, and judged. The institutes at Texas and Southern California also proposed, less explicitly, secondary school courses which will study music as a liberal subject, and not just as a craft whose techniques are to be mastered. Even the institute in Latin at Minnesota, which offered very explicit and practical instruction in how to teach a fully evolved course, preserved a liberal end. One of the reasons for teaching Latin in seventh grade is the establishment of a six-year sequence which will permit Latin texts to be studied as literature, as both interesting in themselves and the creation of a certain historical moment and culture, and not just as material to be translated so that a foreign language can be learned.

This emphasis on the liberal character of the subjects studied was not universal in the arts and humanities institutes of 1966. The institutes in film at Mount Saint Scholastica College and in theater at Wisconsin State, for example, seemed more concerned with using film and theater as instruments to achieve other ends than they were with studying film and theater because they are worthy to be studied. But by and large, the institutes did teach their subjects as if their study was its own sufficient end.

That, at least, was the idea many of the institutes wanted to promote, to the end that the participants themselves would begin so to teach these subjects to their own students. This emphasis does not resolve the issue between the practical and liberal characters of arts and humanities institutes. To call attention to the liberal tone and tilt of most of the institutes of 1966 is to help specify the task of future directors. Those who plan and teach institutes in arts and humanities must find ways to honor at once the liberal character of their subjects and the practical function of their instrument – to find ways to put the practical thing which is an institute in the service of a liberal conception of its subject.

2. What is an institute in arts and humanities for?

One purpose is to change the ways arts and humanities are taught in elementary and secondary schools. Another is to change the ways prospective and experienced elementary and secondary school teachers of arts and humanities are taught in undergraduate and graduate schools.

The first strategy pretty much accepts the established structure and emphases of the elementary and secondary school courses and programs in which arts and humanities are taught. Art, music, theater, literature, Latin, the humanities as a dinstinct subject are now being taught in the schools. No argument need be presented for their presence: there they are. If they are being taught, they ought to be taught well. So the institute at Vermont sends teachers back to their schools, having taught them something about the Elizabethan age which will improve their teaching of Shakespeare; and the institute at the Memphis Academy sends teachers back to their schools, their thin educations in art fleshed out so that they are ready to begin the kind of teaching at which better-educated teachers have always been competent.

The second strategy moves from the argument that the present courses in arts and humanities in the schools are either wrongly conceived, or not sufficiently important, or both. The argument often looks both admiringly and grudgingly at the sciences, which have claimed a prominent place in the schools and are filling that place with radically new courses which fully reward the large attention and tracts of time they require. To win back a properly important place in the schools, the arts and humanities must emulate the sciences and offer new kinds of courses which will make good their claims to be worthy of sustained and serious attention. So the institutes at Iowa, Ohio State, and Texas propose secondary school courses in art and music which are different from most of those now being taught because they conceive music and art not to be a set of techniques to be exercised, but to be subjects with their own structures and histories, susceptible of the same kind of close and extensive study as biology or literature. So, too, the institute in Latin at Minnesota offers not only a new course in its subject, but claims for that subject a place in the curriculum of the junior high school it has not had before.

This distinction raises two other questions. First, who should attend institutes in arts and humanities? The first strategy allows that both well-prepared and poorly educated teachers – the latter inadequate even to the presently dominant kinds of courses in their subjects – are profitably

enrolled in institutes. The second strategy tends to prefer very competent and well-placed teachers whose command of the present curricula is so sure that they can easily move to change themselves and it, and whose responsibilities in their schools or school systems are such that they are free to move, and to set other people in motion when they do.

The second question is: Where should institutes be taught? Again, the first strategy allows that institutes be conducted where there are manifest needs for them. The quite proper claims of the directors of the institutes at Bemidji State and Wisconsin State, for example, were that these colleges served a population very badly served by theaters, museums, and similar institutions, and that, therefore, the institutes could at least begin to remedy the deficiencies of an entire region by remedying those of a certain group of teachers who will take new knowledge and ideas back to their communities. The second strategy, on the other hand, leans toward the very best. It leads to placing institutes in institutions which are extraordinarily well-fitted to demonstrate to the participants day after day what very accomplished people can do when they work in well-appointed classrooms and studios, with good libraries and on exceptionally well-equipped stages and within a setting of great activity and excitement about the study and practice of the arts.

The issue ought not to be closed by the fact that those institutes of last summer which seemed to the visitors to be most promising all moved within the second strategy. For one thing, the second strategy raises the question of why the arts and humanities should have a more powerful place in the schools. To teach Shakespeare better, or to establish a conventional art program in an elementary school which does not have one, is fundamentally to accept established priorities and practices. To introduce a secondary school course in theater or to teach art as a humane discipline rather than a craft is to upset these priorities and balances. Such radical intrusions will require good reasons. Why should elementary and secondary school students have a chance to learn the discipline of art history and the procedures of esthetic analysis and judgment? What is so dangerous about the decline in enrollments in secondary school courses in Latin that the decline ought to be arrested by the introduction of a seventh-grade course?

The answers to these questions are available. They concern the necessity and profit of educating people so that they will comprehend and be aware of the complexities of this enormously full moment of history. But the directors of those shaprly innovative institutes which raise the questions have only begun to require themselves to answer them. And no one has sorted out these tentative answers to address the very much larger question the success of innovative institutes will pose: Is there really room for <u>all</u> these innovations in the curricula of elementary and secondary schools? Is it intended, for example, that everybody study art and music – and perhaps, theater and dance as well?

Further, the inadequacies that the institutes exist to remedy are of such size and diversity that they will not be resolved by one kind of institute, by one kind of course in any one subject, or finally by institutes at all. To turn the head of the procession is not to determine that the rest of it will keep up. Suppose an institute succeds as the vehicle by which, a new course in art is firmly lodged in a secondary school curriculum. It then

creates the new task of educating not the unusually able teacher who initiated the course, but the ordinary teachers who must now learn to teach it. Who will teach them? Institute faculties or other teachers, or instructors in the undergraduate and graduate curricula in which teachers were educated before the institutes were created? Nor is it proper to assume that every secondary school teacher in the country, or even in a state or city, should teach the same kind of course in his subject. Much again must be left to the teachers themselves, to induct one another in the ideas and materials which will change their teaching, and to translate these ideas into courses which will be apt to their own schools, students, and styles of teaching. Institutes begin changes. But they are not the only agent of change, and even the changes they begin must finally be worked out by people who improvise on what they learned in the institute as they teach people who did not attend it. The question each director of an institute must ask himself, then, is not only how ought my subject to be taught in the schools? The question is also: How, at this moment, in this place, can an institute most effectively change those teachers who can change others? There ought to be as many answers to that question as there are moment and places, and not all the answers will be decisions to try to persuade unusually good and powerful teachers to take home a course already prepared for them.

Finally, if the questions about how the institutes should change the schools have not yet been fully resolved, the question about how they should change colleges and universities has not yet really been asked. The undergraduate and graduate curricula in which teachers are prepared are the principal instruments for setting loose new ideas and material, and for making teachers adequate to them. Yet only in the institute at Ohio State, which enrolled some college teachers of art education, is there any sure evidence that the people who organize and teach summer institutes are also thinking about how they might do some of the same things during the year. In part, the question about the effect of the institutes on colleges and universities is a question about who should attend them: college teachers as well as teachers in the schools? Department chairmen and deans as well as members of their faculties? It is also a question of where they should be taught: At major universities or institutions predominantly given to teacher education? In schools and departments of education or in schools of art and music, in institutions like the Memphis Academy, a conservatory, or a school of theater?

The possibilities these questions suggest are arresting. Consider, for example, a short institute, with New York as its campus, in which members of college faculties in art education study specific proposals for educating prospective elementary and secondary school art teachers in twentieth-century painting. Or consider a longer institute, organized to make use of festivals like that at Aspen or writers' conferences like that at Breadloaf, at which people who teach arts and humanities in colleges given principally to teacher education study and practice the procedures of critical analysis and judgment. But however provocative they are, these questions are secondary. Before future directors decide where to place and who should come to institutes explicitly intended to change the ways prospective and experienced teachers are taught, they must first accept that so to change these ways is indeed one of the purposes of institutes in arts and humanities. That point would probably not be contested. But the question of how this purpose is to be acted out has barely been framed, much less prosecuted with specificity and vigor.

3. What does it mean to say that the arts and humanities institutes of 1966 were effective?

The measure of effectiveness which finally matters is that which describes the changes the arts and humanities institutes have worked in the school classrooms where the teachers teach their subjects, and in the college classrooms where the teachers learn their subjects. That judgment will not be drawn with any precision about the arts and humanities institutes of 1966. Some of last summer's institutes have no plans to find out what has happened as a result of the summer. Some have loose, and on their face, inadequate plans: questionnaires, a few visits to convenient schools, an almuni gathering at a teachers' meeting.

The reason for these weak and diffident gestures is in part that the Office of Education is not authorized to support plans to follow and study the results of individual institutes. A result of this is that institute directors have not devoted adequate attention to the ways and ends of a follow-up study: Should its purpose be to continue to educate the participants? To measure the effectiveness of the institute? To help the participants propagate the lessons of the institute in their schools? And again, studies have yet to be made about the effect of the institute on the institution in which it was offered, about what happens to the means by which undergraduates are taught in a university as a result of the faculty members in one or more of its departments spending six months or so planning and teaching an institute. The least satisfying part of the arts and humanities institutes of 1966 is the failure to develop satisfactory ways of continuing their effectiveness after the institute is over.

Given this major failure in the design of the arts and humanities institutes of 1966, one can only guess that when the participants call the institutes "outstanding" in one respect or another, they mean that they think they will teach better next year than they did last year because of something the institute did for them. When the directors and the visitors say the institutes were successful, they mean that too. It is all feeling and intuition. But at least one hard question can be asked about this general feeling that things will go better because of the institutes. If the participants do teach better, what will they teach? What should elementary and secondary school students know about arts and humanities that many of them presumably do not know now?

The emphasis of the institutes of 1966 suggest that students of arts and humanities ought to know something of the history of the subject they are studying. They ought to know the vocabulary of the craft of the art, and the vocabulary and procedures of the critical analysis of its works. Given, for example, a painting, they ought to be able to see it as an historical object, embodying and continuing the characteristics of a certain period, style, and culture. They ought to be able to attend to the physical fact of the painting very closely in order to see how it works and holds together. They ought to be able to say why they like or dislike it. They ought, finally, to learn a curiosity about painting which will move them to look at and read about pictures on their own.

But should all elementary and secondary school students also be taught to practice the art whose works they can comprehend with some acuity and

sophistication? If they should, what is the relationship and proportion of such practice to the study and analysis of the work of others? Should they be able so to see and judge out of a knowledge of the history and nature of more than one of the arts and humanities? Or is it enough to educate students in art alone, or music alone, or dance alone? Is there a body of information and a set of perceptions – a style of knowing – which are common to all the arts and humanities and can be taught as "humanities" rather than as art or music or literature? If there is, is this style, this mode of seeing and judging, best taught in a series of courses, each given to a single discipline, or in a program which considers and continually connects several several disciplines? The institutes of 1966 were not nearly as decisive in their answers to questions like these as they are in their emphasis that teachers need to be taught the history and nature of their disciplines, presumably so that they can teach them to their students. Again, these are questions which probably should not be driven to a single answer. But they certainly ought to be asked and answered more rigorously by the directors of future institutes than they seem to have been asked by the directors of the institutes of 1966.

4. If the arts and humanities institutes of 1966 were effective, what were the principal means of their effectiveness?

It is possible only to guess at why the participants in general judged the institutes favorably. They seemed mostly to be impressed by the emphasis on content and by the strength of the faculties. When they were disappointed, it was usually because the institute seemed incoherent, either because the courses did not fit together to serve a clear purpose, or (less crucially) because the day simply was not organized to flow evenly from one event to the next. The lessons of these speculations are apparent enough, and not surprising: good institutes have good faciulties, a good director, and are organized so that the participants are always sure of why they are being required to do what they are doing, and are always confident that each day's study is moving cogently into the next day's study.

The visitors were struck by two more precise sources of effectiveness and excitement in the institutes, and were disappointed when these characteristics were not there: by how much of what the participants were being taught was new; and by how frequently the participants were involved in their subjects in immediate and concrete ways. Much has already been said in this report about both characteristics. But they are both full of promise, and to return to them here may serve as a final summary of the principal strengths and promises of the arts and humanities institutes of 1966.

The institutes, for one thing, were full of people who were new to the kind of education which happens in summer institutes for teachers – full of painters, composers, actors, singers, musicians, directors, and others who practice their art, and teach others to practice it, rather than teach others to teach it. The faculty of the institute at Vermont included Richard Dyer-Bennett, the singer and extremely learned student of Elizabethan music; Maurice Evans; the Shakespearean scholars James McManaway and John C. Adams; and Duncan Ross, a director at the Stratford (Canada) Shakespeare festival. In the institute in music at Iowa a composer taught analysis;

in the institute at Ohio State the author of a standard study of existentialist esthetics taught a course in phenomenology of esthetic perception and judgment. The entire faculty of the institute at the Memphis Academy was practiced in teaching painters and sculptors, not elementary school art teachers; and many of the people who lectured in the institute at Southern California were accustomed to thinking of how to organize curricula in science and other subject, not how to organize a new curriculum in music. Much of the excitement of the institutes had and needed no more profound source than the surface of freshness and novelty created when people teach or learn new things, or teach or learn in new ways. It apparently was as invigorating and renewing, for example, for the faculty of the Memphis Academy to find themselves teaching elementary school teachers, as it was for the elementary school teachers to find themselves not only studying art history and analysis but working long afternoons on paintings of their own.

The emphasis in some of the institutes on the arts of the twentieth century had much the same effect. Separate courses in the institute at Ohio State considered the history of twentieth-century painting, its relationships with contemporary society, and the esthetic of a dominant contemporary philosophy. The institute at Iowa emphasized contemporary music. The institute in film at Mount Saint Scholastica was by definition given to a powerful contemporary form whose entire history lies in the twentieth century. The institutes in theater at Vermont and Wisconsin State sustained as one of their purposes an attention to how Shakespeare and other playwrights in the conventional repertories are performed right now as well as on the stages of their own time. The reason usually given for this emphasis on the contemporary is that teachers of art and music in particular are not well-educated in twentieth-century painting and music. The effect was, therefore, to bring them into their subject in a new place, and when they discovered that they could comprehend and enjoy these new works of art, the participants also came into a new excitement about their subject and a new confidence in their ability to teach it.

Another source of this sense of renewal and innovation was the decision of some of the directors to use the institutes to propagate new materials or to create new course and programs in elementary and secondary schools. Sometimes the courses and programs were new only in the sense that the participants were not teaching them (e.g., the idea of humanities courses and programs which the institute at Oregon was intended to promulgate) or were not yet competent to teach them (e.g., the elementary school art programs for which the institute at the Memphis Academy hoped to prepare its participants). The ideas, materials, and course outlines promoted in institutes at Minnesota, Ohio State, Iowa, Texas, and Southern California, however, were not just new to the participants. They were themselves simply new. Whether or not the participants use them, in order to enter and command the means and ends of these courses and ideas they had to look at their subjects in new ways, and they had to consider how their subjects might be taught differently.

The several means of engaging the participants directly in their subjects worked toward the same end. The participants talked to one another in seminars in which they were required to attend not to the history of a painting or piece of music, but to the work itself. In the institute at Vermont they attended not only the performances but also the rehearsals of a professional theatrical company and watched it work out step by step the

problems of performing plays the participants were reading and trying to imagine on a stage. In the institute at the Memphis Academy they worked on their own paintings in studios. At Wisconsin State they made costumes, and lighting plots, and directed one another in dramatic scenes they had chosen and blocked out for themselves. At almost every institute they watched someone teach elementary or secondary school children: at Iowa, much more interestingly, they tried to teach one another the history and structure of a piece of music which they thought could be taught to their own students. The participants – quite correctly, in the opinion of the visitors – wanted yet more of these alternatives to lecture courses. But the institutes of 1966 offered enough alternatives to suggest the great promise which lies in permitting or requiring teachers to step close to their subject, to grasp it in a place and way – with a directness – that they had forgotten, or never learned.

Both the newness and immediacy of some of the ways in which the participants were brought to study their subjects in the arts and humanities institutes are promises of their effectiveness. It is likely that those institutes which had already prepared a body of ideas and materials for new courses in the schools will produce immediate effects. The ideas were already on the ground, and moving, when the institutes came along to accelerate them. It is probable, too, that the sharp edge of newness apparent in of the topics and methods of the institutes will excite teachers to change their teaching and their courses so that they can incorporate, for example, what they have learned about Shakespeare's stage, or twentieth-century painting or music, or how a painter sees a painting. It is possible also that to enable teachers to see and literally to experience the subjects differently – to see a painting not as an historical object but as a product of certain decisions about space and light; to imagine plays as people on a stage and not as words in a book: it is possible that to do this is to move teachers to learn, or learn again, how large and full their subject is, and so to persuade them to teach it differently and more variously. In short, it is by engaging their participants in their subjects in new and immediate ways that institutes in arts and humanities promise to move most forcefully to change the teachers who teach arts and humanities in the schools, and to change, through them or for them, the courses they teach.

The final point to be made about the effectiveness of the arts and humanities institutes of 1966 is that if, as a whole, all eleven institutes were effective, one last reason is likely to be the variety of possibilities they tried out. Probably more would have been achieved if all eleven institutes had enrolled teachers of music, say. More, that is, for the teaching of music. But much would not have been tried. Not so many different kinds of courses and purposes would have been defined; not so many different kinds of teachers and participants would have tried to address their subjects and one another in new ways. The decision to invest the limited means available in institutes given to several disciplines risks later losses. If many ideas were planted or nourished last summer, the growth of none is thick and sure. The arts and humanities institutes of 1966 were themselves a beginning which set out many possibilities for this kind of education. To choose to begin in many ways and places was a choice itself full of promices. But it was also to choose not really to conclude anywhere. If the chances opened by the variety of the institutes are not to be dissipated, each of these beginnings must in future years and summers receive as much support as all of them together made full and profitable use of in the summer of 1966.

PART III

PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES TO OFFICE OF EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRES

Table 1 – Summary of Responses

Table 2 – Knowledge and Skills Imparted

Table 3 – Presentations

Table 4 – Organization

Table 5 – Emphasis and Proportion
(Lecture, Audiovisual Presentation, Participation Learning (Seminars), Field Trips, Individual Study Periods, Free Time)

Table 6 – Emphasis and Proportion
(Presenting Information in Subject Area, Presenting Information on Instructional Methodology)

Table 7 – Effectiveness of the Total Institute Program

Table 1. Summary of Participants' Responses to Questionnaires

	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Marginal	Poor	N R
A1. Knowledge and Skills Imparted						
a. Content in subject matter	55.1	32.7	9.3	2.5	0	0
b. Identification of content essential to effective instruction	40.9	44.4	11.3	1.3	0	1.6
c. Improved instructional methodology	33.7	40.0	18.7	3.5	1.3	2.6
d. Improved instructional media	30.5	42.5	18.7	4.9	.6	2.2
e. Curriculum improvement/ innovation	42.5	35.0	13.6	4.8	1.6	2.2
B1. Presentation						
a. Instruction by faculty	45.0	41.5	9.4	1.6	0	2.2
b. Instruction by guest speakers	44.4	38.9	10.7	1.9	1.6	2.2
c. Conduct of workshops, studies, etc.	32.1	47.7	13.6	2.5	.9	2.9
d. Choice of field trips	36.6	22.8	6.8	2.2	3.6	27.7
e. Conduct of field trips	35.7	22.0	6.4	2.8	3.9	29.2
C1. Organization						
a. Library	28.8	42.2	19.8	2.9	3.5	2.6
b. Laboratory, studios, seminars, etc.	26.2	47.8	15.0	1.3	1.6	7.8
c. Instructional equipment	34.7	53.5	6.8	.9	.6	3.2
d. Independent study	32.4	45.6	10.2	3.7	3.7	4.5
e. Group study	32.5	43.0	11.4	3.9	4.5	4.2
f. Living accommodations	45.4	26.6	6.8	1.8	1.6	17.8
g. Recreation	24.6	24.7	12.0	8.4	8.7	21.1
D. Effectiveness of Total Institute	64.2	30.5	4.5	.3	.3	0

	Not Enough	About Right	Too Much	N R
C3. Emphasis and Proportion				
Opinion of relative amount of time apportioned for:				
a. Lectures	5.8	74.4	19.0	.3
b. Audiovisual presentations	19.8	76.6	2.2	1.3
c. Participation learning sessions (studios, seminars)	25.6	64.6	8.7	1.0
d. Field trips	21.1	55.8	3.2	19.8
e. Individual study periods	46.4	48.4	2.2	2.9
f. Free time	50.2	46.7	1.6	1.6
C4. Opinion of relative proportion of institute devoted to:				
a. Presenting information in subject area	17.9	79.5	2.2	.3
b. Presenting information on instructional methods	28.2	63.7	3.5	4.5

Table 2: A.1. Knowledge and Skills Imparted

	Oregon	Bem.	Vt.	WSU	So. Cal.	Iowa	OSU	Minn.
Effectiveness of Total Institute (Outstanding/Good)	53.8/ 38.5	76.9/ 17.9	87.5/ 12.5	22.9/ 68.6	66.7/ 25.6	55.6/ 36.1	73.5/ 26.5	68.4/ 26.3
a. Content in Subject Matter								
Outstanding	41.0	69.2	91.7	14.3	30.8	55.6	76.5	52.6
Good	41.0	25.6	8.3	62.9	35.9	30.6	23.5	42.1
Fair	12.8	5.1	0	20.0	23.1	11.1	0	5.2
Marginal	5.1	0	0	2.9	7.7	5.6	0	0
Poor	0	0	0	0	2.6	0	0	0
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Identification of Content Essential to Effective Instruction								
Outstanding	35.9	56.4	43.7	5.7	48.7	25.0	47.1	60.5
Good	46.1	38.5	37.5	68.6	35.9	50.0	52.9	31.6
Fair	12.8	5.1	8.3	22.9	10.3	25.0	0	8.0
Marginal	2.6	0	2.1	2.9	2.6	0	0	0
Poor	0	0	0	0	2.6	0	0	0
No Response	2.6	0	8.3	0	0	0	0	0
c. Improved Instructional Methodology								
Outstanding	25.6	12.8	18.7	11.4	53.8	30.6	44.1	76.3
Good	38.5	48.7	31.2	48.6	41.0	47.2	47.0	21.0
Fair	30.8	25.6	22.9	37.1	5.1	19.4	5.9	2.6
Marginal	2.6	7.7	10.4	2.9	0	2.8	0	0
Poor	2.6	2.6	2.1	0	0	0	2.9	0
No Response	0	2.6	14.6	0	0	0	0	0
d. Improved Instructional Media								
Outstanding	25.6	35.9	37.5	8.6	20.5	36.1	5.9	68.4
Good	41.0	43.6	41.7	42.9	51.3	50.0	41.2	31.6
Fair	28.2	12.8	8.3	42.9	20.5	13.9	29.4	0
Marginal	2.6	5.1	2.1	2.9	7.7	0	20.6	0
Poor	0	2.6	2.1	0	0	0	0	0
No Response	2.6	0	8.3	2.9	0	0	2.9	0
e. Curriculum Improvement and/or Innovation								
Outstanding	51.3	46.2	37.5	5.7	66.7	36.1	20.6	71.0
Good	30.8	35.9	37.5	42.9	25.6	58.3	20.6	28.9
Fair	15.4	15.4	10.4	37.1	0	5.6	29.4	0
Marginal	0	2.6	4.2	8.6	7.7	0	17.6	0
Poor	0	0	0	2.9	0	0	11.8	0
No Response	2.6	0	10.4	2.9	0	0	0	0

Table 3: B.1. Presentations

	Oregon	Bem.	Vt.	WSU	So. Cal.	Iowa	OSU	Minn.
Effectiveness of Total Institute (Outstanding/Good)	53.8/ 38.5	76.9/ 17.9	87.5/ 12.5	22.9/ 68.6	66.7/ 25.6	55.6/ 36.1	73.5/ 26.5	68.4/ 26.3
a. By Institute Faculty								
Outstanding	66.7	71.8	39.6	5.7	30.8	50.0	76.5	21.0
Good	28.2	23.1	47.9	45.7	61.5	44.4	23.5	55.3
Fair	5.1	0	6.2	37.1	5.1	5.6	0	18.4
Marginal	0	0	0	11.4	0	0	0	2.6
Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Response	0	5.1	6.2	0	2.6	0	0	2.6
b. By Guest Speakers								
Outstanding	53.8	28.2	83.3	20.0	89.7	38.9	0	23.7
Good	46.1	48.7	10.4	45.7	10.3	52.8	52.9	55.3
Fair	0	12.8	0	31.4	0	5.6	26.5	15.8
Marginal	0	5.1	0	0	0	2.8	8.8	0
Poor	0	0	0	2.9	0	0	8.8	3.6
No Response	0	5.1	6.2	0	0	0	2.9	12.6
c. Conduct of Workshops, Studios, Seminars, etc.								
Outstanding	25.6	48.7	45.8	17.1	20.5	22.2	23.5	47.4
Good	53.8	38.5	35.4	45.7	61.5	61.1	52.9	36.9
Fair	17.9	7.7	8.3	25.7	17.9	11.1	8.8	13.1
Marginal	2.6	0	2.1	8.6	0	0	8.8	0
Poor	0	0	0	2.9	0	0	5.9	0
No Response	0	5.1	8.3	0	0	5.6	0	12.6
d. Choice of Field Trips								
Outstanding	64.1	79.5	22.9	60.0	0	5.6	55.9	8.0
Good	33.3	15.4	39.6	28.6	0	11.1	38.2	13.1
Fair	0	0	22.9	8.6	0	5.6	5.9	8.0
Marginal	0	0	4.2	2.9	0	2.8	0	8.0
Poor	2.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	26.3
No Response	0	0	10.4	0	100.0	75.0	0	36.9
e. Conduct of Field Trips								
Outstanding	66.7	53.8	39.6	54.3	0	5.6	58.8	8.0
Good	30.8	35.9	41.7	22.9	0	8.3	14.7	15.8
Fair	0	0	6.2	20.0	0	5.6	11.8	8.0
Marginal	0	2.6	2.1	0	0	2.8	8.8	8.0
Poor	0	0	0	2.9	0	0	5.9	23.7
No Response	2.6	7.7	10.4	0	100.0	77.8	0	36.9

Table 4: C.1. Organization

	Oregon	Bem.	Vt.	WSU	So. Cal.	Iowa	OSU	Minn.
Effectiveness of Total Institute (Outstanding/Good)	53.8/ 38.5	76.9/ 17.9	87.5/ 12.5	22.9/ 68.6	66.7/ 25.6	55.6/ 36.1	73.5/ 26.5	68.4/ 26.3
a. Library								
Outstanding	38.5	38.5	20.8	0	56.4	27.8	23.5	23.7
Good	56.4	38.5	52.1	31.4	33.3	50.0	41.2	31.6
Fair	5.1	17.9	16.7	42.9	10.3	13.9	20.6	34.2
Marginal	0	0	0	8.6	0	0	8.8	8.0
Poor	0	0	2.1	17.1	0	8.3	2.9	0
No Response	0	5.1	8.3	0	0	0	2.9	2.6
b. Laboratory, Studios, etc.								
Outstanding	35.9	43.6	54.2	2.9	10.3	8.3	20.6	21.0
Good	41.0	48.7	22.9	54.3	66.7	58.3	41.2	47.4
Fair	2.6	2.6	4.2	34.3	20.5	25.0	20.6	23.7
Marginal	0	0	0	5.7	0	0	8.8	2.6
Poor	0	0	0	2.9	2.6	0	2.9	2.6
No Response	20.5	5.1	18.7	0	0	0	2.9	2.6
c. Instructional Equipment								
Outstanding	46.1	46.2	54.2	5.7	20.5	27.8	38.2	31.6
Good	43.6	46.2	37.5	62.9	66.7	72.2	50.0	55.3
Fair	5.1	2.6	0	20.0	12.8	0	5.9	10.5
Marginal	0	0	0	8.6	0	0	0	0
Poor	0	0	0	2.9	0	0	2.9	0
No Response	5.1	5.1	8.3	0	0	0	2.9	2.6
d. Independent Study								
Outstanding	33.3	46.2	39.6	11.4	43.6	16.7	32.4	31.6
Good	51.3	41.0	43.7	42.9	46.2	69.4	26.5	44.7
Fair	7.7	5.1	6.2	22.9	10.3	8.3	11.8	13.1
Marginal	2.6	0	0	14.3	0	2.8	2.9	8.0
Poor	0	2.6	2.1	8.6	0	2.8	14.7	0
No Response	5.1	5.1	8.3	0	0	0	11.8	2.6
e. Group Study								
Outstanding	33.3	71.8	39.6	2.9	23.1	22.2	29.4	34.2
Good	46.1	15.4	35.4	51.4	64.1	52.8	38.2	42.1
Fair	10.3	5.1	14.6	5.7	10.3	16.7	5.9	21.0
Marginal	5.1	0	0	22.9	0	0	5.9	0
Poor	0	2.6	4.2	11.4	2.6	5.6	11.8	0
No Response	5.1	5.1	6.2	5.7	0	0	8.8	2.6
f. Living Accommodations								
Outstanding	74.4	48.7	43.7	2.9	0	72.2	76.5	47.4
Good	20.5	46.2	39.6	25.7	0	25.0	17.6	34.2
Fair	0	0	4.2	42.9	0	0	0	8.0
Marginal	2.6	0	0	14.3	0	0	0	0
Poor	0	0	2.1	11.4	0	0	0	0
No Response	2.6	5.1	10.4	2.9	100.0	2.8	5.9	12.5
g. Recreation								
Outstanding	53.8	56.4	29.2	2.9	0	16.7	26.5	8.0
Good	28.2	25.6	45.8	25.7	0	38.9	23.5	8.0
Fair	10.3	10.3	8.3	20.0	0	19.4	5.9	23.7
Marginal	5.1	2.6	2.1	25.7	0	8.3	2.9	23.7
Poor	0	0	0	14.3	0	5.6	20.6	34.2
No Response	2.6	5.1	14.6	11.4	100.0	11.1	20.6	2.6

Table 5: C.3. Emphasis and Proportion

	Oregon	Bem.	Vt.	WSU	So. Cal.	Iowa	OSU	Minn.
Effectiveness of Total Institute (Outstanding/Good)	53.8/ 38.5	76.9/ 17.9	87.5/ 12.5	22.9/ 68.6	66.7/ 25.6	55.6/ 36.1	73.5/ 26.5	68.4/ 26.3
Opinion of relative amount of time apportioned for:								
a. Lectures								
Not enough	0	0	0	20.0	12.8	5.6	2.9	8.0
About right	66.7	92.3	91.7	71.4	76.9	69.4	64.7	57.9
Too much	33.3	7.7	8.3	8.6	10.3	25.0	32.4	34.2
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.9	0
b. Audio-Visual Presentations								
Not enough	12.8	0	10.4	71.4	28.2	25.0	2.9	13.1
About right	87.1	100.0	87.5	28.6	66.7	63.9	88.2	84.2
Too much	0	0	0	0	2.6	8.3	5.9	2.2
No Response	0	0	2.1	0	2.6	2.8	2.9	0
c. Participation Learning (Seminars)								
Not enough	41.0	28.2	14.6	17.1	28.2	27.8	23.5	26.3
About right	56.4	69.2	81.2	62.9	61.5	52.8	58.8	68.4
Too much	2.6	0	4.2	20.0	10.3	19.4	11.8	5.2
No Response	0	2.6	0	0	0	0	5.9	0
d. Field Trips								
Not enough	7.7	5.1	6.2	34.3	0	22.2	1 8	86.8
About right	92.3	94.9	81.2	62.9	0	30.6	7. 5	5.2
Too much	0	0	10.4	2.9	0	0	11 8	0
No Response	0	0	2.1	0	100.0	47.2	.9	8.0
e. Individual Study Periods								
Not enough	23.1	51.3	45.8	57.1	17.9	50.0	70.6	60.5
About right	74.4	46.2	54.2	37.1	66.7	50.0	26.5	26.3
Too much	2.6	2.6	0	2.9	0	0	0	10.5
No Response	0	0	0	2.9	15.4	0	2.9	2.6
f. Free Time								
Not enough	5.1	61.5	58.3	74.3	2.6	44.4	64.7	92.1
About right	87.1	38.5	41.7	22.9	87.2	55.6	29.4	8.0
Too much	7.7	0	0	2.9	2.6	0	0	0
No Response	0	0	0	0	7.7	0	5.9	0

Table 6: C.5. Emphasis and Proportion

	Oregon	Bem.	Vt.	WSU	So. Cal.	Iowa	OSU	Minn.
Effectiveness of Total Institute (Outstanding/Good)	53.8/ 38.5	76.9/ 17.9	87.5/ 12.5	22.9/ 68.6	66.7/ 25.6	55.6/ 36.1	73.5/ 26.5	68.4/ 26.3
Opinion of relative amount of time apportioned for:								
Presenting Information in Subject Area								
Not enough	12.8	2.6	0	25.7	56.4	36.1	0	13.1
About right	82.1	97.4	100.0	74.3	38.5	55.6	100.0	84.2
Too much	5.1	0	0	0	2.6	8.3	0	2.6
No Response	0	0	0	0	2.6	0	0	0
Presenting Information on Instructional Methodology								
Not enough	48.7	41.0	20.8	42.9	17.9	22.2	23.5	10.5
About right	46.2	51.3	62.5	54.3	69.2	69.4	76.5	84.2
Too much	2.6	0	0	2.9	10.3	8.3	0	5.2
No Response	2.6	7.7	16.7	0	2.6	0	0	0

Table 7: D. Effectiveness of the Total Institute Program

	Oregon	Bem.	Vt.	WSU	So. Cal.	Iowa	OSU	Minn.
Effectiveness of Total Institute (Outstanding/Good)	53.8/ 38.5	76.9/ 17.9	87.5/ 12.5	22.9/ 68.6	66.7/ 25.6	55.6/ 36.1	73.5/ 26.5	68.4/ 26.3
Based on your experiences throughout the program, rate the effectiveness of this Institute in helping you to improve your competencies as a teacher:								
Outstanding	53.8	76.9	87.5	22.9	66.7	55.6	73.5	68.4
Good	38.5	17.9	12.5	68.6	25.6	36.1	26.5	26.3
Fair	5.1	5.1	0	8.6	7.7	5.6	0	5.2
Marginal	2.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poor	0	0	0	0	0	2.8	0	0
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF 1966 CONPASS REPORTS

The following list constitutes the bibliography, to date, of reports on assessment of the 1966 NDEA Title XI and Arts and Humanities programs of the U.S. Office of Education by the Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs:

Axelrod, Joseph, FROM UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT TO PROFESSIONAL TEACHER, An Assessment of NDEA Institutes for Undergraduates Preparing to Become Elementary or Secondary Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages, 1967, 66 pp., Tables, Appendices.

Brown, Donald J. and James W. Brown, EFFECTS OF SPECIAL MEDIA INSTITUTE PROGRAMS UPON THE BEHAVIOR OF TITLE XI NDEA INSTITUTE DIRECTORS (English, History, Geography, Reading, Modern Foreign Languages, and School Library Personnel), Department of Audiovisual Instruction (National Education Association) for CONPASS, 1966, 72 pp., Tables, Appendix.

Gray, Donald J., REPORT ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES INSTITUTES OF 1966, 1966, 27 pp., Tables.

The above report was based in part on visitation reports by Grose Evans, Curator, Extension Services, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; John F. Latimer, Classics Department, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.; John F. Morrison, Dean, College of Fine Arts, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio; and Lee Rigsby, Director, School of Music, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Hackett, F.D., J.A. Schad, and R.E. Stake, REPORT ON THE SUMMER 1966 INDUSTRIAL ARTS INSTITUTES, 1966, 17 pp., Tables.

Hook, J.N., NDEA INSTITUTES FOR TRAINERS OF TEACHERS (SUMMER, 1966), 1966, 82 pp., Appendix, Tables.

Longaker, Richard, and Robert Cleary, REPORT ON EVALUATION OF PILOT CIVICS INSTITUTES, NDEA 1966, 1966, 7 pp.

Reese, Jim E. and Robert L. Darcy, REPORT ON THE 1966 NDEA ADVANCED STUDY INSTITUTES IN ECONOMICS, 1966, 25 pp., Tables, Appendix.

Shugrue, Michael F., Carl A. Barth, and Leo Ruth, AN EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ENGLISH INSTITUTE MATERIALS CENTER CURRICULUM MATERIALS IN NDEA SUMMER INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH, 1966, Tables, Appendices.

van Teslaar, A.P., REPORT ON THE JOINT EUROPEAN-UNITED STATES NDEA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, MANNHEIM-HEIDELBURG, 30 June-24 August 1966, 1967, 19 pp., Appendix.